6.2 The State and Globalisation

about 60 minutes · Write-in edition

Total Marks

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / _____

Answer all 12 questions. Use dated examples and distinguish legal authority from practical constraints.

1 Explain how technological change can deepen interconnectedness between states and societies in global politics.

(Total for Question 1 is 3 marks)

2 Explain how hyperglobalisers, globalisation sceptics and transformationalists differ over the continuing role of the state.

(Total for Question 2 is 3 marks)

3 Using the 2007/2008 global financial crisis as your dated example, explain one advantage and one disadvantage of economic interconnectedness and give one reason why its impact on sovereignty need not be identical for every state.

(Total for Question 3 is 5 marks)

4 Analyse and evaluate how a realist and a liberal would interpret the relationship between sovereignty and interconnectedness. Apply both perspectives to Miller I (2017) in the UK's withdrawal process after the 2016 referendum and to the 2007/2008 global financial crisis.

(Total for Question 4 is 12 marks)

5 Evaluate the extent to which globalisation has reduced the sovereignty of nation-states. Use competing interpretations and concrete dated examples, and consider both the advantages and disadvantages of retaining state sovereignty.

(Total for Question 5 is 30 marks)

6 A hypothetical multinational company in 2026 threatens to move new investment abroad if a state raises its tax rate. Parliament retains the legal power to set that rate. Explain how this situation challenges state sovereignty without establishing that the company has become sovereign.

(Total for Question 6 is 5 marks)

Mark scheme · 6.2 The State and Globalisation

Question 1

Identifies a relevant mechanism, such as faster digital communication linking people or firms across borders. **B1**

Explains how it intensifies a cross-border relationship, such as coordinating production or spreading ideas more rapidly. **B1**

Further develops how the mechanism deepens cross-border connections, for example through more frequent exchange, sustained collaboration, mutual dependence or exposure to disruption elsewhere. Credit other coherent developments; mutual dependence is not required. **B1**

Answer: Digital communication allows firms in different states to coordinate production quickly. Suppliers and customers become more dependent on each other, so a disruption in one country can interrupt activity in another.

Question 2

Hyperglobalisers see global integration as substantially eroding state autonomy, for example through mobile capital and markets. **B1**

Sceptics emphasise continuing state power and the limited or uneven nature of integration; globalisation need not supersede states. **B1**

Transformationalists emphasise the reorganisation of state power and sovereignty, with uneven outcomes rather than inevitable state disappearance. Credit accurate equivalent interpretations. **B1**

Answer: Hyperglobalisers emphasise declining state autonomy under global integration. Sceptics stress enduring state power and uneven integration. Transformationalists see state power being reshaped in varied ways, rather than simply abolished.

Question 3

Advantage identified: cross-border finance can widen access to investment or spread financial risk. **B1**

Advantage developed: access to external funds can support activity beyond the resources available domestically; credit other valid developed benefits without claiming the crisis itself was beneficial. **B1**

Disadvantage identified: interconnected financial systems can transmit shocks across borders, illustrated by the 2007/2008 crisis. **B1**

Disadvantage developed: dependence on external credit or confidence can constrain national policy choices even where legal powers remain. Accept other valid developments, such as transmitted losses reducing lending and therefore investment or employment. **B1**

Explains uneven impact, for example states differ in financial exposure, resources or policy capacity. Credit an accurate reason linked to variation rather than claiming identical loss of sovereignty everywhere. **B1**

Answer: Cross-border finance supplies investment beyond domestic savings, supporting additional productive activity. In the 2007/2008 global financial crisis, financial links also transmitted losses and credit shortages internationally, constraining national policy choices even where legal powers remained. States differed in financial exposure and resources available to respond, producing unequal effects on practical sovereignty.

Question 4

Level 0 No relevant content. **0**

Level 1 Limited relevant knowledge of a perspective or example; mostly assertion or description, with little analysis or evaluation. **1-3**

Level 2 Some accurate knowledge and application of perspectives to examples, with partially developed explanation and limited evaluation. **4-6**

Level 3 Clear analysis of both perspectives applied to both dated cases, with relevant evidence and a reasoned assessment of their explanatory strengths and limits. **7-9**

Level 4 Sustained analysis and evaluation of both perspectives using both dated cases precisely, distinguishing legal authority from practical constraints and reaching a supported judgement. Credit different valid arguments and conclusions; indicative content is not a checklist. **10-12**

Indicative content:

- Realism foregrounds states, sovereignty and national interests. The withdrawal process after the 2016 referendum can be read as an attempt to exercise national choice. Miller I (2017) located the necessary domestic authority in Parliament, rather than giving ministers unrestricted power.
- Liberalism emphasises interdependence, rules and the possibility of cooperation. The crisis of 2007/2008 illustrates shared vulnerability and a reason to cooperate; this is an argument for cooperation, not proof that states always cooperate successfully.
- A realist can recognise financial interdependence while stressing that states retain interests and make policy choices. Dependence is not evidence of a world government.
- A liberal can regard lawful collective commitments as an exercise of sovereignty that can improve effective capacity, while recognising that they constrain unilateral choices.
- The cases test different dimensions: Miller I concerns the domestic legal route to changing an international relationship; the financial crisis concerns practical exposure across borders. Neither alone establishes that sovereignty has disappeared.
- A supported judgement may favour realism for explaining the continuing importance of national authority, liberalism for explaining shared problems and cooperation, or a qualified combination. These approaches are not identical to the hyperglobaliser, sceptical and transformationalist categories. Credit alternative accurate applications.

Question 5

Level 0 No relevant content. **0**

Level 1 Limited relevant knowledge of sovereignty or globalisation; assertions and descriptions dominate, with little analysis or judgement. **1-6**

Level 2 Some accurate knowledge and examples, with partial explanation of globalisation and sovereignty. Evaluation is limited or uneven and conclusions have little support. **7-12**

Level 3 Clear knowledge and analysis of competing arguments, supported by relevant dated examples. Considers legal authority and practical constraints and gives a reasoned judgement, although development may be uneven. **13-18**

Level 4 Detailed, accurate knowledge supports sustained analysis and evaluation of competing interpretations. Weighs evidence about different dimensions of sovereignty, advantages and disadvantages, and reaches a well-supported judgement. **19-24**

Level 5 Precise knowledge, well-chosen dated examples and sustained evaluation establish criteria for judging the extent of change in sovereignty. Weighs competing interpretations, distinguishes legal authority from practical constraints and assesses advantages and disadvantages of state sovereignty. Reaches a convincing supported judgement; different supported judgements and valid examples can receive full marks. Indicative content is non-exhaustive. **25-30**

Indicative content:

- Define the nation-state and sovereignty, then distinguish the legal right to decide from the practical ability to achieve an outcome. A conclusion depends partly on which dimension is being assessed.
- Hyperglobalisers emphasise how mobile capital and interconnected markets restrict national economic autonomy. The 2007/2008 global financial crisis illustrates exposure to cross-border shocks, but does not establish that every state lost legislative authority.
- Sceptics emphasise continuing state choices and uneven integration. The withdrawal process following the 2016 EU referendum can support an argument about continuing national agency. Miller I (2017) required parliamentary authorisation for Article 50, showing domestic constitutional rules still mattered; it did not ban withdrawal or guarantee freedom from costs.
- Transformationalists can interpret these cases as evidence of reconfigured rather than extinguished state power: legal authority persists while the costs and effectiveness of using it change across policy areas and states.
- Realists stress states and national interests; liberals emphasise interdependence and cooperation. Either can recognise constraints without claiming that state sovereignty has vanished.
- Economic globalisation can widen investment and trade opportunities while transmitting crises and making states responsive to mobile firms. Benefits and costs can be distributed unevenly within and between states.
- Political globalisation and international law can constrain unilateral decisions while enabling joint action on environmental harm or rights protection. Global governance is not necessarily world government. Detailed institutional surveys are not needed.
- Cultural globalisation can spread ideas and widen cultural choice while creating pressures towards homogenisation. Cross-border influence over identity does not by itself abolish legal state authority.
- Sovereignty can protect self-determination, domestic accountability and policy diversity. It can also obstruct joint action, enable free riding or shield abusive rulers from external pressure. Humanitarian or forcible intervention can challenge territorial control; its legality, legitimacy and practical effect require separate assessment rather than an assumption that all intervention is lawful.
- One defensible judgement is that globalisation substantially reduces effective sovereignty because cross-border financial and environmental dependence narrows feasible choices even when legal powers remain. Another is that states remain decisive because constitutional authority and the power to choose commitments endure. A third is uneven transformation across states and issues. No preferred conclusion is required; credit any coherent, evidenced judgement and alternative accurate dated examples.

Question 6

Identifies the company as a non-state actor able to influence decisions through mobile investment.	**B1**
Explains a possible practical cost of the tax change, such as reduced employment or revenue if investment moves.	**B1**
Explains how anticipating that cost may discourage the state from using its formal power.	**B1**
Recognises that Parliament retains legal authority over the tax rate in the stated scenario.	**B1**
Explains why influence over the state's decision is not sovereignty: the company does not acquire legislative authority through its threat, and Parliament can still choose to raise the tax despite the costs. Credit equivalent explanations distinguishing practical constraints from legal authority; limits to corporate mobility are not required.	**B1**

Answer: The company is a non-state actor with bargaining power because investment can move. Possible lost jobs or revenue may discourage a tax rise. Parliament still legally sets tax: influence over the choice does not transfer legislative authority to the company. Parliament can reject the threat and raise the tax despite the possible costs.